

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
ARIZONA STRIP FIELD OFFICE
CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION REVIEW**

CX-AZ-120-2008-001

PROJECT TITLE: White Pockets protective enclosure

PROJECT LEAD: Linda Price

PROPOSED ACTION: Unauthorized motor vehicles are traveling off of the existing route and out on to rock formations of White Pockets. The proposed action is to install 360 lineal feet of post and rail fencing to enclose the end of the route into White Pockets, in order to protect the geologic resources of the area by blocking vehicle access. A walk through opening will be provided in the center of the fence. Carsonite signs marking the area as closed to motorized vehicles will be placed behind the fence.

LOCATION OF PROPOSED ACTION: The project is located in north central portion of the Vermilion Cliffs National Monument in T41N R5E section 18, east of the Coyote Buttes area.

PLAN CONFORMANCE REVIEW: The proposed action has been reviewed for conformance with the Arizona Strip District Resource Management Plan (1992).

The proposed action is in conformance with the RMP. The Off Highway Vehicle designation in the project area is "limited to designated roads and trails". However, the activity plan called for in the 1992 RMP was never written; therefore the area is managed as "limited to existing roads and trails".

RR32: Provide visitors to the Canyons and Plateaus of the Paria Resource Conservation Area with accurate information regarding recreation opportunities, interpretation of natural and human history, and specific rules and regulations pertaining to their use of public lands.

WS17: Manage public lands in a manner that protects scientific, environmental, air and atmospheric, and water resources.

Conformance with the Vermilion Cliffs National Monument Proclamation and Interim Management Policy (2000)

The Vermilion Cliffs National Monument proclamation specifically lists the geologic resources as monument objects; and as such obligates the BLM, under the Antiquities Act, to protect them. The Interim Management Policy (IMP) for National Monuments is silent on this particular type of project, however the proposed action is consistent with the intent of the IMP by protecting geological resources that are a monument object.

CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION REVIEW: The proposed action is categorically excluded under 516 DM 6, Appendix 5.4:

J9 Construction of small protective enclosures, including those to protect reservoirs and springs and those to protect small study areas.

The proposal has been reviewed to determine if any of the exceptions described in 516 DM 2, Appendix 2, apply. Surname(s) verify completion of this review by appropriate specialists.

NAME	LIST OF EXCLUSION CRITERIA <i>Assign surnames for determination under each below</i>
_____	1. The proposal would have no adverse effects on public health or safety: Price
_____	2. The proposal would not adversely affect unique geographic characteristics such as park, recreation, or refuge lands, wilderness areas, wilderness study areas, wild and scenic rivers, sole or principal drinking water aquifers, prime farmlands, wetlands, floodplains, or ecologically significant or critical areas, including those listed on the Department's National Register of Natural Landmarks: Folks
_____	3. The proposal would have no adverse effects on historic or cultural resources: Herron
_____	4. The proposal would have no highly controversial environmental effects: Price
_____	5. The proposal would have no highly uncertain or potentially significant environmental effects nor does it involve unique or unknown environmental risks: Price
_____	6. The proposal would not establish a precedent for future action or represents a decision in principle about a future consideration with potentially significant environmental effects: Price
_____	7. The proposal is not directly related to other actions with individually insignificant, but cumulatively significant effects: Price
_____	8. The proposal would not adversely affect properties listed or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places: Herron
_____	9. The proposal would not adversely affect a plant species listed or proposed to be listed on the list of endangered and threatened species, nor have adverse effects on designated critical habitat for these species: Hughes
_____	10. The proposal would not adversely affect an animal species listed or proposed to be listed on the list of endangered and threatened species, nor have adverse effects on designated critical habitat for these species: Denniston
_____	11. The proposal would not require compliance with Executive Order 11988 (Floodplain Management) or Executive Order 11990 (Protection of Wetlands): Price
_____	12. The proposal would not require compliance with the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act: Denniston
_____	13. The proposal does not threaten to violate a federal, state, local or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment: Benson
_____	14. The proposal is in conformance with the Arizona Strip District Resource Management Plan/ Environmental Impact Statement (January, 1992) Price

DECISION: We have reviewed this plan conformance and NEPA compliance record and have determined that the proposal is in conformance with the approved land use plan, that it would have no significant environmental effects, and that no further environmental analysis is required.

REVIEWED BY: _____ DATE: _____

Environmental Coordinator - Arizona Strip

IT IS MY DECISION TO IMPLEMENT THE PROPOSAL, AS DESCRIBED, WITH THE STIPULATIONS IN THE ATTACHMENT.

APPROVED BY: _____ DATE: _____

Field Manager - Arizona Strip

The following people were sent this document for review:

Gloria Benson, Native American Coordinator

Tom Folks, Recreation/Wilderness/VRM

Laurie Ford, Lands/Realty/Minerals

Tom Denniston, Wildlife/ T&E

John Herron, Cultural

Lee Hughes, Special Status Plants

Ray Klein, GCPNM Supervisory Ranger

Linda Price, S&G

Bob Sandberg, Range/Vegetation

Richard Spotts, Environmental Coordinator

Ron Wadsworth, Supervisory Law Enforcement

LD Walker, Weed Coordinator

Andi Rogers (E-mail address: arogers@azgfd.gov)

Rick Miller (E-mail address: rmiller@azgfd.gov)

LeAnn Skrzynski (E-mail address: lskrzynski@kaibabpaiute-nsn.gov)

Responses were received from everyone except Rick Miller and LeAnn Skrzynski. John Herron provided a CRPR and Tom Folks suggested a walk through for pedestrians, the proposed action was modified.